

REMARKS

Claims 14-16, 34, and 37 are amended. Claim 13 is canceled without prejudice. Claims 2-12 and 17-33 are withdrawn. Claims 41 and 42 are new. Claims 1, 14-16, and 34-42 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

Claim Objection

Claims 13-16 are objected to for allegedly being in improper form. However, claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice and claims 14-16 have been amended in a manner that appears to render this objection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 13-16, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2005/0137904 to Lane et al. (hereinafter "Lane") in view of an NPL reference by Hiranaka et al. (hereinafter "Hiranaka").

Response to §103 Rejection

In making out the rejection of independent claim 1, the Office relies on Lane and Hiranaka and argues that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that neither Lane nor Hiranaka, either singly or in combination, teach all the claimed subject matter. For example, the Office relies on the Abstract and Paragraph [0082] of Lane for teaching "...determining a uniform resource locator for a selected asset lookup service of the received global routing prefix" as claimed. However, these excerpts from Lane are silent with respect to a global routing prefix, let alone

determining a uniform resource locator "***based on the global routing prefix...***". (Emphasis Added). Instead, these excerpts and Lane in general merely describe reading an EPC from a RFID tag and then transmitting the EPC to an ONS server. (See e.g., Paragraphs, [0080]-[0082], [0093], etc. of Lane). Furthermore, Hiranaka fails to remedy this deficiency. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Office does not address the claim language "***based on the global routing prefix, determining...***" when making out this rejection. (Emphasis Added). (See Page 3 of Office Action). As such, this rejection is not complete since there does not appear to be any indication in the record that all the words of this claim have been considered. (See e.g., 37 CFR §1.104 and MPEP §2143.03).

Neither Lane nor Hiranaka, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggest all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Claims 14-16 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are not taught or suggested by Lane or Hiranaka, either singly or in combination.

In making out the rejection of independent claim 34, the Office relies on Lane and Hiranaka and argues that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither Lane nor Hiranaka, either singly or in combination, teach all the claimed subject matter. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant has amended this claim to recite: "formatting a uniform resource locator from the received global routing prefix and a predetermined uniform asset lookup service suffix". This subject matter is missing from Lane and Hiranaka. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection

and allow this claim.

Claims 35-40 depend from claim 34 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 34, are not taught or suggested by Lane or Hiranaka, either singly or in combination.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this communication, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: Nov. 30, 2009

By: /rich bucher/ 57,971 for P. W. Mitchell

Paul W. Mitchell, Reg. No.: 44,453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382